UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/457,189	12/08/1999	JULIA HIRSHBERG	1999-0368B	7396

7590 10/10/2002

SAMUEL H DWORETSKY
AT & T CORP
PO BOX 4110
MIDDLETOWM, NJ 077484110

EXAMINER
ANWAH, OLISA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2645	6

DATE MAILED: 10/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/457,189	HIRSHBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Olisa Anwah	2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/24/02 .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in-
> (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
> (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

2. Claims 1-10 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by Epstein et al. U.S. Patent No. 6327343 (hereinafter Epstein).

Regarding claim 1, Epstein discloses a system comprising:

a transcription component (transcriber 32) for transcribing one or more voicemail messages into text (col. 5, lines 14-17);

a text retrieval component (indexer/prioritizer 34) for indexing the one or more transcribed voicemail messages (col. 13, lines 31-34);

an information extraction component (ASR/NLU 24) for identifying selected information within the one or more indexed voicemail messages (col. 5, lines 14-18); and

a user interface (GUI) for displaying the identified selected information from the one or more indexed voicemail messages (col. 14, lines 11-13).

Regarding claims 2 and 3, see col. 9, lines 50-55. Epstein discloses the user may program the system (col. 9, line 34). Hence the search mechanism is user configurable.

Regarding claim 4, Epstein discloses a message body screen (page) (col. 4, lines 1-3) and a main information screen (col. 14, lines 11-13).

Regarding claim 5, Epstein discloses a method comprising the steps of:

identifying information within the plurality of voicemail messages (col. 9, lines 50-55). Epstein discloses this can be done for more than one message (col. 9, lines 43-44); and

providing a user interface (GUI) to a user for access to information identified in the plurality of voicemail messages (col. 14, lines 11-13), wherein the information is identified using entity extraction and summarization techniques (col. 13, lines 33-36).

Regarding claim 6, see col. 5, lines 57-59.

Regarding claim 7, Epstein discloses a method of recording and storing audio files (col. 4, lines 66-67) and then entity extraction is performed on the stored audio files (col. 5, lines 15-18).

Regarding claim 8, Epstein discloses a method comprising the steps of:

receiving the plurality of voicemail messages as raw audio (col. 4, lines 66-67);

transcribing the plurality of voicemail messages into text (col. 5, lines 16-17);

indexing the text of the plurality of voicemail messages (col. 13, lines 33-34); and

extracting information from the text of plurality of voicemail messages, wherein the information extracted provides the user with a summary of the information contained within each voicemail message (col. 13, lines 33-37);

Regarding claim 9, Epstein discloses a system comprising:

means for transcribing a plurality of voicemail messages (voice data) into searchable text (col. 5, lines 15-17). Epstein discloses the voice data comprises of recordings from a plurality of messages retrieved from voice mail or answering machines (col. 4, lines 66-67);

means for searching for text within the plurality of voicemail messages (col. 5, lines 17-18);

Regarding claim 10, see col. 5, lines 57-59.

Regarding claim 16, Epstein discloses a system comprising:

a transcript (page) of a plurality of voicemail messages which is generated by automatic speech recognition (col. 4, lines 1-2 and col. 5, lines 15-16);

a textual display of the transcript of the plurality of voicemail messages (col. 4, lines 1-3); and

a search mechanism for searching for text within the plurality of voicemail messages (col. 5, lines 16-17).

Regarding claim 17, see col. 13, lines 33-34.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Epstein in view of Hon et al, U.S. Patent

Application Publication No. US/2001/0044724 A1 (hereinafter Hon).

Regarding claim 12, Epstein discloses a method comprising the steps of:

generating by automatic speech recognition, a transcript (readable text) of at least one voice mail message (col. 5, lines 15-16); and

providing a search mechanism for searching for text within the at least one voicemail message (col. 5, lines 50-55);

Epstein does not disclose a method of providing for speech playback of selected text within the voicemail message.

However Hon discloses a method of providing for speech playback of selected text (page 2, paragraph 0011).

Again Epstein allows a method comprising the steps of: generating by automatic speech recognition, a transcript of at least one voicemail message and providing a search mechanism for searching for text within the at least one voicemail message. Hon allows a method of providing for speech playback of selected text. Allowing for speech playback of selected text is well known in the art because a user can simply select a desired portion of a message to playback as opposed to playing back the entire message. Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Epstein with a method of providing

for speech playback of selected text within the voicemail message as taught by Hon. This modification allows a user to simply select a desired portion of a message to playback as opposed to playing back the entire message.

Regarding claim 13, see Epstein, col. 5, lines 57-59.

Regarding claim 14, see Epstein, col. 14, lines 11-13.

Regarding claim 15, see Epstein, col. 13, lines 33-34.

5. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Epstein in view of Bobo II, U.S. Patent No. 6350066 (hereinafter Bobo).

Regarding claim 18, Epstein as applied in claim 16 does not disclose a search results display for displaying the results of a user initiated search.

However Bobo discloses a user interface comprising a search results display for displaying the results of a user initiated search (see Figure 21).

Again Epstein allows a transcript of a plurality of voice messages that is generated by automatic speech recognition, a textual display of the transcript of the plurality of voicemail messages and a search mechanism for searching for text within the plurality of voicemail messages. Bobo allows a user interface comprising a search results display for displaying the results of a user initiated search. Allowing for a search

results display for displaying the results of a user initiated search is well known in the art because it allows the user to easily differentiate search results from the actual message. Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Bobo with a user interface comprising a search results display for displaying the results of a user initiated search. This modification allows the user to easily differentiate search results from the actual message.

6. Claims 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Epstein in view of Greco et al, U.S. Patent No. 5568540 (hereinafter Greco).

Regarding claim 18, Epstein as applied in claim 16 does not disclose a header information screen which summarizes each of the plurality of voicemail messages.

However Greco discloses a header information screen which summarizes each of the plurality of voicemail messages (see Figure 2).

Again Epstein allows a transcript of a plurality of voice messages that is generated by automatic speech recognition, a textual display of the transcript of the plurality of voicemail messages and a search mechanism for searching for text within the plurality of voicemail messages. Greco allows a header information screen which summarizes each of the plurality of

voicemail messages. Allowing for a header information screen which summarizes each of the plurality of voicemail messages is well known in the art because it allows a user to simply glance at the screen in order to obtain specific information about a voice message as opposed to having to play the entire message. Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Epstein with a header information screen which summarizes each of the plurality of voicemail messages as taught by Greco. This modification allows a user to obtain specific information concerning a voice message by simply glancing at the header information screen.

Regarding claim 11, Epstein as applied in claim 9 does not disclose means for displaying the plurality of voicemail messages on a computer screen.

However Greco discloses means for displaying the plurality of voicemail messages on computer screen (see Figure 2).

Again Epstein allows means for transcribing a plurality of voicemail messages into searchable text, and means for searching for text within the plurality of voicemail messages. Greco allows for means displaying the plurality of voicemail messages on a computer screen. Displaying the plurality of voicemail messages on a computer screen is well known in the art because it allows a user to view a plurality of voicemail messages all

at once and then select one voice messages as opposed to sequentially going through all voice mail messages one message at a time. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Epstein with a means of displaying the plurality of voicemail messages on a computer screen as taught by Greco. This modification allows a user to view a plurality of voice messages then select one message from the plurality of voice messages.

Response to Arguments

7. Examiner agrees with applicant that Epstein teaches and discloses a programming GUI. However examiner disagrees that Epstein does not disclose an interface for browsing and gisting messages. Epstein discloses recording voice messages and then transcribing the audio into text (col. 13, lines 40-50). Epstein further discloses the transcribed message can be retrieved through a graphical user interface (col. 14, lines 10-13). It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that graphical user interfaces are used for graphically browsing and gisting. Therefore Epstein teaches and discloses the present invention.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 703-305-4814. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 703-305-4895. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned

are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

O.A.
Olisa Anwah
Patent Examiner
October 3, 2002

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600